DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 445 HE 033 043

AUTHOR Montez, Joni; Wolverton, Mimi
TITLE The Challenge of the Deanship.
PUB DATE 2000-04-25
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Deans; *Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; *College Administration; *Deans; Higher Education; Leadership Qualities; Organizational Effectiveness; Private Colleges; School Administration; State Universities; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the evolution of the kinds of challenges that deans have met over time and examines perceptions of today's deans concerning their ability to deal effectively with current challenges. A sample of deans (n=695) in the colleges of education, business, liberal arts, and nursing at 360 public and private institutions was surveyed and asked to identify and rank order the three biggest challenges they expected to face in the next three to five years, and to rate how effectively they thought they would address each challenge. Seven general categories of anticipated challenges were identified: fiscal, administration, curriculum and program development, faculty, technology, personal balance, and diversity. The three rated most important were: (1) fiscal; (2) administration; and (3) curriculum and program development. Significant differences were found across the challenges, but no significant differences were found among deans grouped by minority status, institute type, and institutional rating. Regarding administrative challenges, older deans (age 50) and those with less than two years experience tended to see themselves as more effective than those who had longer tenure. (Contains 16 references.) (CH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 445

THE CHALLENGE OF THE DEANSHIP

By

Joni Montez
Washington State University

Mimi Wolverton
Washington State University

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
April 25, 2000
New Orleans, Louisiana

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ME 033 043

THE CHALLENGE OF THE DEANSHIP

Challenges are future roles-in-the-making. Few are truly eliminated. Most are either met, ameliorated, or persist and grow stronger. As such, they are subsumed, almost without realization into our daily routines as tasks to deal with, as roles to fulfill. There is a sort of seductiveness about the whole process, and we all fall victim to this seduction at one time or another. Those in leadership positions are particularly susceptible to its subtle appeal. They rise to the occasion; they step forward and accept more responsibility. They are seduced into believing that they can continually do more--that they can, in fact, expand the one resource they need most, but which remains intractable. Time.

A successful dean effectively manages the challenges confronting him/her by guiding the course of the college's tension-driven energy in the right direction. These deans fall victim to the dilemma of needing to create change in an environment with little commitment to do so (Yarger, 1998). The conundrum, of course, is that as soon as the climate becomes conducive to change, more challenges arise that preclude change from occurring. This paper addresses the evolution of the kinds of challenges that deans have met over time and provides insight into the perceptions of today's deans concerning their abilities to deal effectively with current challenges.

Evolution of the Deanship and Its Challenges

"Before the Second World War there was not that much to manage on a university campus, and after that war and up until the late sixties, there was too much to manage, and so the American higher educational establishment expanded largely without focus or direction" (Tucker & Bryan, 1988, p. 3).

The challenges faced by deans have continued to evolve and increase over the years. In 1979, Scott cited four groups of deans' concerns: (1) extraordinary circumstances (such as student protests), (2) budget items (salaries and operating expenses), (3) curriculum and program development and (4) faculty personnel issues (resignations, replacements for retirements, and tenure failures). In its evolution toward management, the addition of roles, such as strategic planning, fundraising, and developing and meeting institutional and external accountability measures created more challenges to the deanship (Dill, 1980). In the 1990s, further challenges included representing the university within the community and recruiting diverse faculty and students from previously underrepresented groups (Wolverton, Gmelch, Wolverton & Sarros, 1999) as well as becoming political advocates for invoking the influence of college-outsiders, such as legislators and potential donors (Gardner, 1992).

Balanced administrators, Creswell et al. (1991) say, are persons who will make time to (1) take care of personal needs, (2) spend time with their families, (3) engage in physical activities as a mental break, and (4) coordinate aspects of their personal and professional lives. The subtleness with which such challenges eventually evolved into decanal roles intensified the imbalance between deans' personal and professional lives (Creswell, Olson, & Donovan, 1991).

As we head into the 21st century, the rapid advances in technology make it incumbent upon deans to seriously consider augmenting and/or replacing classroom settings. Where many contemporary deans were trained in a low-technology environment, the population of young people raised on PCs and Nintendos will undoubtedly place tremendous pressure upon deans to consider and incorporate the new technologies (Guskin, 1994).

Finally, yet another important challenge to the academic dean rests in the charge to be a change agent (Hilosky & Watwood, 1997). As change agents, deans must possess "a burning commitment to improve the institution" (p. 50) and engage in the innovative practice of infusing fresh ideas about teaching, learning, and assessment into the college (Wisniewski, 1998). In defining the kind of innovative practice in which deans must engage, Huffman-Joley (1992) states they must become experts in the change process, build a vision of what the college would look like if change were brought about, and take the initiative in planning and implementing change, an important and difficult role. Indeed, in defining today's dean, Wisniewski (1998) asserts that change agentry is a requisite aspect of the position; following the traditional and routine expectations of the deanship means "just being a bureaucrat":

> One's actions beyond the normal expectations are what may move the dean into the role of change agent. The most critical part of being a change agent is to generate and support ideas and possibilities. . . . [T]he basic qualities for the dean are patience, good listening skills, and a sense of humor. Whatever the dean's personality, there must be consistency between the dean's behavior and the advocacies of being advanced (Wisniewski, 1998, p.51).

Thus, in the process of implementing change, deans are again placed in the position of managing tensions between the various factions of a college (faculty, staff, students), while keeping the organization focused on its mission and goals (Austin, Ahearn, & English, 1997). When the staff's anxiety emerges from the change process, the dean must absorb and contain it, maintaining temporary stability and emotional support while the past and future of the organization are joined together (Austin et al., 1997). To complicate matters further, deans who perceive the need to create change confront a dilemma that emerges--"only the faculty, not the dean, can do it, but the faculty don't really want to do it at all" (Yarger, 1998, p. 127).

> The dean's dilemma is a very real one. The dean is usually the one expected to lead the school to bigger and better things--few deans are hired with the mandate to maintain the status quo. Thus, the dean's dilemma presents a ready-made tension between the dean and the faculty. The energy created by this tension can be directed either wisely or foolishly. The dean who can steer the tension-driven energy in the right direction is the dean who will be successful (Yarger, 1998, p.141).

Colleges and universities in the 21st century will not be the same as they are today. The needs of higher education students, whose average age is expected to be 25 years early in the coming year, will require new means of delivery of educational services (Lewis & Smith, 1994). Competition with other educational institutions will be brought on by technological developments and the reality of long-distance education (Lewis & Smith, 1994).

Indeed, Birnbaum (1992) described the paradox that deans face as shepherding higher education into the 21st century while attempting to survive in a culture unsupportive of change. Ironically, this expansion of responsibilities will serve as a stranglehold on effecting institutional change if we do not begin to consider not only what the challenges are, but how to deal with them.

Methodology

This paper discusses the responses provided by deans to two questions in the National Study of Academic Deans (NSAD) (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton, & Hermanson, 1996).[1] Each dean who responded to this section of the survey (N=695) was asked (1) to identify and rank in the order of importance, the three biggest challenges s/he faced as dean in the next 3 to 5

[1]Research instruments used in the survey include the Dean's Stress Inventory (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton & Hermanson, 1996), Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Questionnaire (Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970), Dean's Task Inventory (Gmelch et al., 196), Satisfaction with Dean's Role (Gmelch et al., 1996), Dean's Leadership Inventory (Rosenbach & Sashkin, 1995) and demographic and contextual variables (Gmelch et al., 1996).

years (1 is most important), and (2) to rate how effective (1=ineffective through 5=very effective) each dean believed s/he would be at addressing each challenge. In addition, deans were asked to rate their current level of overall leadership effectiveness (1=ineffective through 5=very effective) .

The sample comprised deans from one of the following three groupings of Carnegie classifications--Research I and II and Doctoral I and II; Masters I and II; or Baccalaureate I and II. From the initial group of colleges and universities, 60 public and 60 private institutions were randomly selected from each Carnegie category, resulting in a sample of 360 institutions. At each of the same institution, the deans of the colleges of education, business, liberal arts, and nursing were asked to complete the survey. (In previous survey research, where department chairs were randomly sampled, researchers found that less than 10% of the respondents were female. Assuming that this pattern might hold true for deans as well, colleges of nursing were included in a purposeful attempt to increase the number of female respondents.)

Findings

Profile of Deans in the Study

The overall sample size consisted of 1,370 deans, with a response rate of 60%. The responses received generated a relatively well-balanced sample in terms of gender; 41% of the responding deans were women. As to their overall leadership effectiveness, male deans tended to rate themselves slightly lower ($\bar{x}$=4.07) than female deans ($\bar{x}$=4.19).

Deans, on average, were 54 years old. Fewer than 10% were under the age of 40 years; less than 5% were 65 years of age or older. The average length of time spent as dean was 5.6 years. Sixteen percent of the respondents had served in their positions for one year or less and

only 12.8% had been deans for more than 10 years. Of the respondents, 58% work in public institutions, 42% in private universities. One-third are deans in research universities (44% of this subgroup were female); 46% are at comprehensive universities (38% female); the remaining 21% are located at baccalaureate institutions (42% female). Twenty-two percent of the male respondents plan to return to faculty; 19% said they had no plans to change careers, and 19% planned to retire. For female respondents, corresponding percentages were 26%, 14%, and 15%.

Roughly 12% of the respondents held minority status, with African-Americans comprising more than one-half of this segment of the sample. This group of deans rated their overall leadership effectiveness the same as that of nonminority deans ($\bar{x}$=4.13). The minority-status pool was evenly divided along gender lines. Thirty-two percent of the minority respondents were deans at research universities; 42% were located at comprehensive universities, and the remaining 26% worked at baccalaureate colleges. A higher percentage of deans of color planned to return to faculty (27%); a lower percentage anticipated staying in their current positions (11%); 21% said retirement would be their next career move.

Challenge Categories

Seven general categories of anticipated challenges emerged from the NSAD responses; they are shown below with a sampling of the responsibilities listed therein:

1. Fiscal: budget and finance, allocation and use of resources, internal and external fundraising.

2. Administration: working with top administration, long-range planning, reorganization, community outreach, public and legislative accountability.

3. Curriculum and program development: development of curricula and programs, recruiting high quality students, dealing with unprepared students.

4. Faculty: recruit and retain faculty, dealing with difficult personnel, moving faculty toward change.

5. Technology: Distance learning, upgrading technology.

6. Personal balance: Balancing personal and professional lives, attaining personal goals.

7. Diversity: Ensuring diversity of faculty and student population

Deans, for the most part, agreed on the top three challenges that they face in the near future. These include: fiscal, administration, and curriculum and program development. Almost 30% of all respondents to this question rated fiscal challenges number one. Twenty-six percent chose administration as their number one choice; 20% chose curriculum and program development, about 14% chose faculty issues; fewer mentioned technology (5%), personal balance (3%), or diversity (<2%) as top choices. (See Table 1.)

However, males and females differed as to the order of magnitude of challenges one and two, with men believing that fiscal issues provided the greatest challenge and women thinking that dealing with the administration would prove more crucial. Male deans (18.6%) rated fiscal responsibilities as their number one anticipated challenge, followed by administration (14.5%). In contrast, more women deans (11.5%) rated administration as their number one challenge, followed by fiscal issues (10.9%). Curriculum and program development was next rated as the most important challenge by both gender groups (males=11.8%; females = 8.1%), followed by faculty issues (males = 7.8%; females = 6.7%). Five percent or less rated any of the remaining categories of technology, personal balance, or diversity, as the greatest challenge they face.

Table 2 shows how the top three challenges were ranked by gender, age, decanal experience, and minority status. Most deans, regardless of age, saw fiscal issues as the greatest

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

challenge. However, deans under 50 years of age viewed dealing with the administration as the next most crucial challenge (with more of these deans suggesting it as their second or third choice) and deans over 50 years old indicating that curriculum and program development would fall in these categories. Experience as a dean seemed to cause some differentiation with those with less than 5.6 years (the mean), selected fiscal, faculty, and administrative challenges (in that order), and those with more experience who chose fiscal, curriculum and program development, and administrative, respectively. Perceived challenges varied slightly for minority and nonminority deans with minority deans rating fiscal, curriculum, and faculty as one, two , and three, and nonminority rating fiscal, curriculum, and administrative as their three top challenges.

When asked how effective they felt they would be in dealing with these challenges in the next 3 to 5 years, most deans rated themselves slightly higher than average (on a 5-point Likert scale, 1=least effective, 5=most effective) in all categories. Most deans who rated curriculum and program development as the number one challenge felt their effectiveness would be moderately high ($\bar{x}$=3.9); those who ranked administration and personal balance issues as their no. 1 anticipated challenge followed with respective means of 3.82 and 3.78. Deans dealing with faculty ($\bar{x}$=3.59), finance $\bar{x}$=3.39), technology ($\bar{x}$=3.43) and diversity issues ($\bar{x}$=3.36) rated their anticipated effectiveness lower. (See Table 3.)

Differences in Groups Across Challenges

Significant differences of deans' perceptions of their future effectiveness were noted in several variables; see Table 4 for a summary thereof. No significant differences across challenges were found among deans grouped by minority status, institute type, and institutional

rating. Likewise, no significant differences were found in deans who had no interest in changing careers.

Administration. Older (>50)[2] deans felt they would be more effective in dealing with administration challenges. Also, deans who had less than two years of experience[3] tended to see their effectiveness in meeting administrative challenges as greater than those who had worked as a dean for more than two years.

Diversity. On this issue, deans in their position for more than two years rated themselves as more effective in meeting the future challenges. Deans of health sciences felt they would be less effective in dealing with the challenge of diversity.

Faculty. Deans whose next career move was anticipated to be to return to a faculty position saw themselves as less effective than those who were not returning. Likewise, deans of arts and sciences rated their effectiveness in dealing with faculty lower than did their disciplinary counterparts.

Personal Balance. On this issue, female deans tended to regard their effectiveness as lower than male deans. Deans who were not planning to retire rated themselves as more effective than those planning to retire in dealing with the challenge of personal balance. Deans of business colleges thought they would be less effective in dealing with this challenge than would deans of other colleges.

---

[2]We used the age, 50 years, as the cut point because it allowed for comparison of the youngest quartile to the rest of the sample. There was some suspicion that the group might view their challenges differently than those older deans did, especially those closer to retirement.

[3]The two-year cutoff was used in this analysis to contrast the least experienced quartile with the balance of the sample.

Technology. Deans of education rated their effectiveness in meeting the challenges of technology higher than deans of other colleges. Conversely, arts and sciences deans rated their effectiveness lower.

Discussion

Data from this study suggest that the four primary kinds of challenges that today's deans expect to encounter in the near future are similar to those cited by Scott (1979). Fiscal matters, administration, faculty issues, and curriculum and program development are and continue to be at the top of all deans' lists of challenges. In addition, deans acknowledge that the issues of technology, personal balance, and diversity have surfaced as challenges. Few (<10%) deans regard them as the most important challenges, irrespective of group comparison. This, despite the onslaught of high technology, the changing face of student and faculty populations, and mounting concerns over balance issues in academe. It is interesting that diversity was regarded as the most important challenge by the least number of deans and, ironically, was not considered the no. 1 challenge by any minority-status dean (only one considered it to be the no. 2 anticipated challenge).

In studying differences, we find more interesting phenomena. As noted above, deans who have held the position for less than two years believe they will be more effective at meeting administrative challenges than deans who have practiced longer. It may be that deans who have practiced longer do not receive the benefit of continued training and development. It may also be that with the increase in their term as dean there is a commensurate (and perhaps overwhelming) increase in responsibilities; with these added responsibilities come more challenges and thus, they are rendered less effective in meeting them. Clearly, this makes the case for continued

professional training and development. It also raises the specter of the need to redefine the deanship in order to more effectively spread out the responsibilities at that level.

Another curious difference that emerged was with respect to the challenge of faculty issues; deans who were returning to the ranks of faculty rated themselves as less effective in dealing with these issues than those who were not returning. This may underscore the lack of preparation that the deans have received; it is no doubt a difficult task to make decanal decisions which are contrary to the very issues that they may raise as faculty members.

Differences in dealing with the issues of diversity emerged in deans of health sciences. This leads to postulate that the notion of diversity encompasses not only racial or ethnic groups but gender groups as well. Health profession programs are traditionally and socially gender biased; medical schools are predominantly male while nursing schools are predominantly female. Given the high number of nursing school deans in this study, it is not surprising that these deans see their effectiveness in overcoming diversity challenges as lower. Much like the deans returning to faculty status, these deans are placed in the tenuous position of arguing for equity in the ranks where they themselves have developed outside of such a system.

Differences on the challenge of technology emerged in deans of education and business colleges. Deans of education felt they would be more effective in dealing with this challenge and deans of business colleges thought they would not. While it is consistent to expect deans of education to be effective in meeting the challenges of technology, given the fact that technology plays a great part in the future classroom, it is curious that business deans feel the reverse. Technology plays a large role in today's businesses. It is requisite that the colleges from which business majors emerge provide them with adequate and current instruction on the use of

technology; the dean must ensure proficiency not only in his/her faculty and students but in him/herself as well. This brings to light the need for continuously updating the deans' training, development, and exposure to what the market is demanding.

Another interesting finding is that while deans rated themselves above average in their ability to be effective in meeting theses challenges, none of them rated themselves extremely high. In fact, the average effectiveness ratings on all challenges was lower than their self-reported estimate of leadership effectiveness, which was greater than 4 on the same 5-point scale. A clue to this disparity may be found in some of the responses given by deans to an open-ended question found at the end of the survey. This question asked the deans to provide comments on their role as dean that were not included in the survey. The sampling of some of these responses reflects the frustration with the dilemma presented by the job:

> Deans are not academic but the manager of funding resources.
>
> Lack of preparation for having to deal with budget and personnel issues which take up 75% of my time.
>
> Union environment limits role of dean.
>
> Legal issues, litigation.
>
> Deanship is a crucial role though not perceived that way by faculty or administration. Lack of understanding of the role leads to conflict and frustration.
>
> Conflict with upper administration (authoritative style) when dean likes to work in consultative way.
>
> The state does not appear to value higher education. This sad state of affairs adds much stress to my job and my faculty.
>
> Limited resources and ambition on the part of the college makes for high stress for everyone.
>
> Position is both frustrating and rewarding.

Never have enough time.

Frustration at having others control much of my day.

Not for the faint of heart.

Implications

The delineation of challenges presented in this paper underscores several possible needs. First, it points to the need for continued professional training and development. Deans must keep abreast of changes occurring in the law, the legislatures, the administration, the discipline of his/her college, and the political, social, and economic pressures upon academe today. For example, diversity issues will not go away. Instead, they are liable to intensify with all sorts of political, economic, and social ramifications for colleges and their deans. One prospect is to study leadership in other complex organizations outside the academy and glean from this knowledge base the kinds of techniques and methods of dealing with challenges to improve effectiveness.

Second, there is the need to emphasize personal balance. The deans divide their time between home and work; and between being a professional administrator and academic. Some deans might benefit from training in time management and organization, along the lines promulgated by Townsend and Bassoppo-Moyo (1996).

Finally, each of the seven challenges that deans face represents a job, in and of itself. Deans are only moderately sure of dealing with these issues successfully because they may recognize the futility of attempting to "do it all." Universities need to seriously rethink the configuration of traditional college and university administration. Treating the deanship as a

partnership between two or more equals (co-deans, co-CEOs) rather than a sole proprietorship headed by one omnipotent dean may result in more effectively led colleges and universities.

Conclusion

"Not for the faint of heart" may say it all. Today, deans face mounting challenges that in all probability work against them as they strive to be effective administrators. Time is a finite commodity and demands on this fundamental resource seem to be outstripping its availability. Thinking "outside the box" could put a new face on the deanship. Nothing will be lost in doing so; only a tremendous amount of progress can be gained.

REFERENCES

Austin, M. J., Ahearn, F. L., & English, R. A. (Eds.). (1997). *The professional dean: Meeting the leadership challenges.* (Vol. XXV). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works: Understanding success and failure in the college presidency.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Creswell, J. W., Olson, B. J., & Donovan, J. (1991). Dimensions of balance in an administrator's life. *Administrator's Update, 8*(1-2), 1-8.

Dill, W. R. (1980). The deanship: An unstable craft. In D. E. Griffiths & D. J. McCarty (Eds.), *The dilemma of the deanship* (pp. 261-284). Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc.

Gardner, W. E. (1992). Once a dean: Some reflections. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(5), 357-366.

Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Hermanson, M. (1996). *The 1996 national survey of academic deans in higher education.* Pullman, WA: Washington State University, The Center for Academic Leadership.

Guskin, A. E. (1994). Reducing student costs and enhancing student learning: The university challenge of the 1990s. Part I: Restructuring the administration. *Change*(July/August), 23-29.

Hilosky, A., & Watwood, B. (1997). Transformational leadership in a changing world: A survival guide for new chairs and deans. *ERIC document.*

Huffman-Joley, G. (1992). *The role of the dean: Fostering teaching as scholarship in the school of education learning community.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Antonio, TX.

Lewis, R. G., & Smith, D. H. (1994). *Total quality in higher education.* Delray Beach, FL: St. Lucie Press.

Scott, R. A. (1979). The "amateur dean" in a complex university: An essay on role ambiguity. *Liberal Education, 65*(4), 445-452.

Townsend, B. K., & Bassoppo-Moyo, S. (1996). *If I'd only known: Administrative preparation that could have made a difference.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Association, New York, NY.

Tucker, A., & Bryan, R. A. (1988). *The academic dean: Dove, dragon and diplomat*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Wisniewski, R. (1998). The new Sisyphus: The dean as change agent. In D. Thiessen & K. R. Howey (Eds.), *Agents, Provocateurs: Reform-Minded Leaders for Schools of Education* . Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M. L., & Sarros, J. C. (1999). Stress in academic leadership: U.S. and Australian department chairs/heads. *The Review of Higher Education, 22*(2), 165-185.

Yarger, S. J. (1998). Addressing the dean's dilemma. In D. Thiessen & K. R. Howey (Eds.), *Agents, provocateurs: Reform-minded leaders for schools of education* . Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Table 1. No. 1 Challenges by Gender

Challenge	Total Responses	%	Male	%	Female	%
Fiscal	207	29.7	128	18.6	75	10.9
Administration	181	26.0	100	14.5	79	11.5
Curriculum/program development	138	19.9	81	11.8	56	8.1
Faculty	100	14.5	54	7.8	46	6.7
Technology	35	5.1	22	3.2	13	1.9
Personal balance	23	3.3	11	1.6	12	1.7
Diversity	11	1.6	10	1.5	1	.1
TOTAL	695		406		282	

Table 2. Comparison of Challenges Ranked No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 Across Selected Groups

	Gender		Age		Decanal Experience		Minority Status	
Challenge	Male	Female	<50	>50	<5.6	>5.6	Min	NonMin
Fiscal	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Administration	2	1	2,3		3	3		3
Curr/Prog Dev.	3	3		2,3		2	2	2
Faculty					2		3	
Technology								
Personal Balance								
Diversity								

Table 3. Response Distribution of Effectiveness in Meeting Future Challenges

Challenge	N	Mean	Min	Max	SD
Curriculum & Program Dev.					
As No. 1	138	3.90	2.0	5.0	.7042
No. 2	160	3.85	2.0	5.0	.7456
No. 3	142	3.76	1.0	5.0	.8746
Administration					
As No. 1	181	3.82	1.0	5.0	.8042
No. 2	149	3.73	2.0	5.0	.8252
No. 3	161	3.68	1.0	5.0	.8305
Personal Balance					
as No. 1	23	3.78	2.0	5.0	.9514
No. 2	16	3.38	2.0	5.0	.7188
No. 3	42	3.59	2.0	5.0	.8281
Faculty					
As No. 1	100	3.59	2.0	5.0	.7167
No. 2	157	3.62	1.0	5.0	.8197
No. 3	117	3.50	1.0	5.0	.8869
Fiscal					
As No. 1	207	3.39	1.0	5.0	.7353
No. 2	130	3.51	2.0	5.0	.7586
No. 3	105	3.31	1.0	5.0	.8559
Technology					
As No. 1	35	3.43	1.0	5.0	.7391
No. 2	55	3.70	2.0	5.0	.7852
No. 3	45	3.53	2.0	5.0	.8686
Diversity					
No. 1	11	3.36	3.0	4.0	.5045
No. 2	9	3.55	3.0	5.0	.7265
No. 3	17	3.23	2.0	5.0	.7524

Table 4. Significant Differences of Means in Anticipated Effectiveness Scores on Challenges

Challenge	Mean	*t*-statistic	*p*-value*
Administration			
Age			
≥50 years	3.86	1.68	.099
<50 years	3.59		
Decanal experience			
≥2 years	3.77	-1.72	.092
<2 years	4.03		
Diversity			
Experience			
≥2 years	4.00	-5.29	.001
<2 years	3.22		
Nursing College			
Yes	3.00	-2.530	.035
No	3.44		
Faculty Issues			
Next career move:			
Return to faculty position			
Yes	3.39	-1.91	.061
No	3.66		
Liberal Arts College			
Yes	3.39	-1.69	.098
No	3.68		
Personal Balance			
Gender			
Female	3.42	-2.09	.049
Male	4.18		
Retirement			
Yes	3.20	-2.32	.034
No	3.94		
Business College			
Yes	3.00	-4.076	.001
No	3.86		
Technology			
Education			
Yes	3.75	1.876	.074
No	3.32		
Arts & Sciences			
Yes	3.13	-2.077	.048
No	3.66		

*p-values assume a 2-tailed test